

Remarks

A. Pending Claims

Claims 1, 5-11, and 15-25 are rejected. Claims 1, 5, 7-11, and 15-25 are pending.

B. The Claims Are Patentable Over Ochiai et al. Pursuant To 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 11, 16, 21, and 22-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,757,482 to Ochiai et al. (hereinafter “Ochiai”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,781,228 to Sposato. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

Claim 1 describes a combination of feature including, but not limited to, the features of: wherein said playback means comprises:

a first navigator unit comprising a first program for reading out the control information in the storage device by said second input means in the first playback mode, analyzing the readout control information, and controlling read of the multimedia information in the storage device in accordance with an analysis result; wherein the first program is stored in the multimedia information playback apparatus; and

a second navigator unit comprising a second program for controlling read of the multimedia information in the storage device on the basis of the control information distributed from the network server in the second playback mode, wherein the second program is obtained from the network server.

As noted in Applicant’s previous response, Ochiai does not appear to teach or suggest the combination of the features of the claim, including, but not limited to the feature of having two distinct navigator units, the first running an internally loaded program, the other running an externally obtained program. Applicant further submits that the combination of Ochiai and Sposato does not appear to teach or suggest the features of Applicant’s claimed method.

Applicant’s claims include, but are not limited to the features of “a first navigator unit comprising a first program for reading out the control information in the storage device by said

second input means in the first playback mode, analyzing the readout control information, and controlling read of the multimedia information in the storage device in accordance with an analysis result; wherein the first program is stored in the multimedia information playback apparatus.”

With respect to Ochiai, the Examiner appears to equate the CPU of Ochiai with the first navigation unit. The CPU of Ochiai appears to control display of the multimedia information by reading a “script.” For example, Ochiai states:

When the viewer (the user of the received broadcast data dynamic editing device 100) requested playback of a broadcast program according to the script by operating a remote control unit etc. of the received broadcast data dynamic editing device 100, the CPU 5 interprets each line of the script one by one and thereby reads out broadcast data corresponding to each line of the script from the HDD 11.

(Ochiai, Col. 7, line 66 – Col. 8, line 5)

The broadcast data read out from the HDD 11 one by one according to the script is displayed by the video output device 7, thereby the broadcast program according to the script is shown to the viewer.

The CPU of Ochiai appears to be capable of receiving a “script” and interpreting the script to control the display of the multimedia data. The “script” of Ochiai appears to be related to Applicant’s claimed “control information.” In the device described by Ochiai, the CPU appears to include a program that is capable of reading the “script” and controlling playback information of the basis of the read script. The program of Ochiai is not explicitly described but is implicit based on the above-cited sections of the specification. This program of the CPU of Ochiai appears to be related to Applicant’s claimed “first program”

Applicant’s claims are further directed to “a second navigator unit comprising a second program for controlling read of the multimedia information in the storage device on the basis of the control information distributed from the network server in the second playback mode, wherein the second program is obtained from the network server.” Referring again to the device of Ochiai, the “scripts” of Ochiai appear to be related to the control information. As noted by the Examiner, Ochiai appears to teach that scripts may be obtained from the local storage device (e.g., HDD) or from a network server. Applicant, however, notes that claim 1 further describes

obtaining “the second program from the network server.” Ochiai does not appear to teach or suggest this feature. Specifically, there is no teaching or suggestion that the program used by the CPU of Ochiai to read the “scripts” is obtained from a remote source. In contrast, Applicant’s claims are directed to a method of obtaining a different program (i.e., the second program) from a network sever that will interpret the control information. Applicant’s claims are directed to a second navigator system that can obtain a new program for interpreting control information (such as the “scripts” described by Ochiai). Applicant submits that this feature is neither taught nor suggested by the cited art.

As such, Applicant submits claim 1 is patentable over Ochiai. Applicant submits that an arrangement for obtaining a “second program” form a network server is neither disclosed by Ochiai nor by Sposato. In addition, even if the CPU disclosed in Ochiai is modified in view of Sposato, the arrangement for obtaining a “second program from the network sever” would not be attained. Applicant further submits that the claims dependent on claim 1 (claims 5, 7-10) are patentable over Ochiai.

For at least the reasons state above, Applicant submits that claims 1, 11, 16, 21, and 22-25 and the claims dependent thereon are patentable over Ochiai.

C. The Claims Are Patentable Over Ochiai In View of Sposato and further in view of Kamo Pursuant To 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 5 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ochiai in view of Sposato and further in view of U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2002-0057694 to Kamo (hereinafter “Kamo”). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 5 and 15 are patentable over the combination of Ochiai, Sposato and Kamo.

D. The Claims Are Patentable Over Ochiai In View of Sposato and further in view of Dan Pursuant To 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 7, 9, 17, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ochiai in view of Sposato and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,561,637 to Dan et al. (hereinafter “Dan”). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 7, 9, 17, and 19 are patentable over the combination of Ochiai, Sposato and Dan.

E. The Claims Are Patentable Over Ochiai In View of Sposato and further in view of Brown Pursuant To 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 8 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ochiai in view of Sposato and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,732,179 to Brown et al. (“Brown”). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 8 and 18 are patentable over the combination of Ochiai, Sposato and Brown.

F. The Claims Are Patentable Over Ochiai In View of Sposato and further in view of Mages Pursuant To 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 10 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ochiai in view of Sposato and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,035,329 to Mages et al. (hereinafter “Mages”). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 10 and 20 are patentable over the combination of Ochiai, Sposato and Mages.

H. Additional Remarks

Based on the above, favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully requests a one-month extension of time to respond to the Office Action dated July 6, 2007. A fee authorization form is enclosed for the extension of time fee. If any fees are required or if any fees have been overpaid, please appropriately charge or credit those fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account Number 50-1505/5664-00100/EBM.

Respectfully submitted,
/Mark R. DeLuca/

Mark R. DeLuca
Reg. No. 44,649
Patent Agent for Applicant

MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, Texas 78767-0398
(512) 853-8800 (voice)
(512) 853-8801 (facsimile)

Date: November 5, 2007